

**Appl. No. 09/851,066**  
**Amdt. dated June 24, 2005**  
**Reply to advisory action of June 7, 2005**

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Advisory Action dated June 7, 2005. In that Action, the Examiner continued the rejection of rejected claims 1-22 as obvious over Agrawal in view of Rucker. With this Preliminary Amendment, Applicants amend claims 1, 8, 15, and 22. Based on the amendments and arguments contained herein, Applicants believe the present application to be in condition for allowance.

Applicants amend claim 1 to recite that the "record" comprises variables and information for "at least some of said variables." Further, two courses of action are provided in the claim depending on whether the record comprises information for all of the variables or for some, but not all, of the variables. In the first case, a first classification tool is used to classify the record. In the second case (the record having information for some, but not all, of the variables), a second classification tool is used instead upon determining that the first classification tool requires a particular item of information that is missing from the record. Applicants do not find this combination of limitations present in the cited art. Applicants do not find that Rucker or Agrawal teaches or suggests processing records that may or may not have information for all of the variables associated with the record or the use of different classification tools depending on whether or not the record has information for all of its variables. At least for these reasons, Applicants believe claim 1 and its dependent claims are patentable over the art of record.

Applicants amend claim 8 to recite that the "record" comprises variables and information for "at least some of said variables." Further, two courses of action are provided in the claim depending on whether the record comprises information for all of the variables or for some, but not all, of the variables. In the first case, a first classification tool is used to classify the record. In the second case (the record having information for some, but not all, of the variables), a second classification tool is used instead upon determining that the first

**Appl. No. 09/851,066**  
**Amdt. dated June 24, 2005**  
**Reply to advisory action of June 7, 2005**

classification tool requires a particular item of information that is missing from the record. As explained above, Applicants do not find this combination of limitations present in the cited art and accordingly believe claim 8 and its dependent claims are patentable over the art of record.

Applicants amend claim 15 to recite that the "record" comprises variables and information for "at least some of said variables." Further, two actions are provided in the claim depending on whether the record comprises information for all of the variables or for some, but not all, of the variables. In the first case, a first classification tool is used to classify the record. In the second case (the record having information for some, but not all, of the variables), a second classification tool is used instead upon determining that the first classification tool requires a particular item of information that is missing from the record. Applicants do not find that Rucker or Agrawal teaches or suggests processing records that may or may not have information for all of the variables associated with the record or the use of different classification tools depending on whether or not the record has information for all of its variables. At least for these reasons, Applicants believe claim 15 and its dependent claims are patentable over the art of record.


Applicants also amend claim 22 to require the use of different classification tools depending on whether the record being classified has information for all of its variables or for only a subset of its variables. The art of record does not teach or suggest this combination of limitation. Accordingly, Applicants believe claim 22 is patentable over the art of record.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. It is believed that no extensions of time or fees are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a), and any fees required (including

**Appl. No. 09/851,066**  
**Amdt. dated June 24, 2005**  
**Reply to advisory action of June 7, 2005**

fees for net addition of claims) are hereby authorized to be charged to Hewlett-Packard Development Company's Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

Respectfully submitted,



Jonathan M. Harris  
PTO Reg. No. 44,144  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
Legal Dept., M/S 35  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400